



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,765	10/19/2000	Thomas E. Saulpaugh	5181-65700	8734

7590 05/23/2005  
Robert C Kowert  
Conley Rose & Tayon PC  
P O Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/692,765

Applicant(s)

SAULPAUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/05, 1/25/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-48 are subject to examination.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

#### **Section 102(e) Rejections:**

##### **Applicant's argument: Claim 1**

Regarding claim 1, Bass clearly fails to anticipate receiving a message in a data representation language sent to a client platform in the distributed computing environment from a service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an event generated by the service, contrary to the Examiner's assertion.

##### **Examiner's response:**

Claim 1 recites:

- (1) "receiving a message in a data representation language ", as such, the message consists of a data representation language,
- (2) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "the message includes a data representation language representation of an event ", as such, the message includes and represents an event, and
- (3) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes ", as such, the message representing and including the event is sent to one or more processes.

Bass teaches in col. 3, line 43-50, Fig. 1, " Thus, the flow of information for FIG. 1 is as follows. An event originating in a process adapter 18 in domain 112 is delivered to the subscribing channel adapter 14. This event would be transformed into (for example) an e-mail via SMTP, (a message in a data representation language) and mailed from the channel adapter through the Internet to domain 213. The e-mail is received by the channel adapter 15 and re-transformed back into the event (the message includes a data representation language representation of an event). The channel adapter then delivers the event to any subscribing process adapters within the domain. (sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes)"

**Applicant's argument:**

The Examiner contends that by disclosing the translation of event information into network protocol messages, Bass discloses "that an event (message) can be represented in any data representation language and will be converted back into the event format for use in the other domain" (Office Action, page 3, lines 4-6). However, the Examiner's interpretation of Bass is incorrect.

**Examiner's response:**

Bass teaches in col. 3, line 41-42, "or whatever protocol is useable by the connecting network. ", and further explains in the same column, line 45-50, by giving example," This event would be transformed into (for example) an e-mail via SMTP, and mailed from the channel adapter through the Internet to domain 213. The e-mail is received by the

Art Unit: 2154

channel adapter 15 and re-transformed back into the event. The channel adapter then delivers the event to any subscribing process adapters within the domain.”

**Applicant’s arguments:**

“The Examiner does not provide any support for his assumption that Bass discloses “that an event (message) can be represented in any data representation language.”

Bass teaches only the translation of event information into existing network protocol messages, such as an SMTP email, TCP/P packet, or FTP transfer message. Bass does not teach that the messages sent using these protocols are data representation language messages.”

“Bass does not mention using data representation language messages.”

“The prior art does not teach the use of a data representation language to represent events in messages between entities in a distributed computing environment.”

“Additionally, Bass fails to anticipate wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an event generated by the service. In contrast.”

“Bass clearly does not teach a message that includes a data representation language representation of an event.”

**Examiner’s response:**

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., data representation language messages) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification

Art Unit: 2154

are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Please also refer to Bass's disclosure as stated and explained above.

**Applicant's argument:**

"Furthermore, Bass fails to anticipate sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service."

"Bass also does not teach delivering the event to the subscribing process in a data representation language representation. Thus, Bass fails to anticipate sending a data representation language representation of an event, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner has failed to cite any portion of Bass that refers to data representation language representations of events.

**Examiner's response:**

Claim 1 recites:

- (1) "receiving a message in a data representation language ", as such, the message consists of a data representation language,
- (2) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "the message includes a data representation language representation of an event ", as such, the message includes and represents an event, and
- (3) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes ", as such, the message representing and including the event is sent to one or more processes.

Bass teaches in col. 3, line 43-50, Fig. 1, " Thus, the flow of information for FIG. 1 is as follows. An event originating in a process adapter 18 in domain 112 is delivered to the subscribing channel adapter 14. This event would be transformed into (for example) an e-mail via SMTP, (the message includes and represents an event,), and mailed from the channel adapter through the Internet to domain 213. The e-mail is received by the channel adapter 15 and re-transformed back into the event(the message includes and represents an event,). The channel adapter then delivers the event to any subscribing process adapters within the domain. (sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service).

**Applicant's argument: Claim 2**

"Regarding claim 2, Bass fails to anticipate receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein the data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service."

"The Examiner has not cited any portion of Bass that teaches a data representation language schema defining a message interface for a set of events. Instead, Basses Bass teaches that each channel adapter includes two different interfaces for communicating event information."

"Bass does not teach that his event export lists make up a data representation language schema. Bass also does not mention that the event export lists are exchanged using a

Art Unit: 2154

data representation language. Furthermore, Bass does not describe his event export lists as defining message interfaces.”

“Bass does not teach generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema.”

“Thus Bass clearly fails to disclose generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema.”

**Examiner’s response:**

Bass teaches in col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15, “Each channel adapter is initialized (generating an event message endpoint ) with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain. The two channel adapters handshake with these sets of events. Process adapters within each domain can then publish events of the exported type and expect the event to be carried to the other domain via the network protocol. Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event.” Thereby the reference teaches that each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain and they handshake with sets of events even though they are in a completely different domains (receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein said data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service).

Please also refer to Bass’s disclosure as stated and explained above.



**Applicant's argument: Claim 3**

"Regarding claim 3, Bass fails to teach the event message endpoint subscribing to one or more of the set of events generated by the service, wherein the service is configured to send messages including data representation language representations of an event to subscribers to the event when the event is generated."

**Examiner's response:**

In conjunction with the above, Bass teaches in col. 3, line 49-50, "The channel adapter then delivers the event to any subscribing process adapters within the domain."

**Applicant's argument: Claim 4**

In regards to claim 4, Bass fails to teach wherein the data representation language message from the service includes an authentication credential for the service."

**Examiner's response:**

Bass's Col. 1, lines 56-60 describes the purpose of its invention as being "Therefore, there is a need in the art for a mechanism to link to disparate PUB/SUB domains together without compromising security, reducing performance, be easy to implement, and still allow for information transfer between the two domains. " and as such the process described in col. 4, line 57 through col. 5, line 15 teaches the elements of claim 4.

**Applicant's argument: Claim 5**

Regarding claim 5, Bass fails to anticipate the event message endpoint verifying type correctness of the data representation language message according to the data representation language schema.

Art Unit: 2154

**Examiner's response:**

Bass teaches in col. 4, line 18-24, "Each channel adapter also includes reporting mechanism 26, 27. This mechanism informs the administrator of the status of the events being processed by the adapter. The administrator could determine if there are any events that are stuck, and the state in which they are stuck. This would permit the administrator to perform error reporting to the system, as well as initiate recovery mechanisms."(the event message endpoint verifying type correctness of the data representation language message according to the data representation language schema.)

**Applicant's argument: claim 6**

Regarding claim 6, Bass fails to anticipate wherein the data representation language schema defines a set of messages that the service may send to the event message endpoint and further fails to teach the event message endpoint verifying the correctness of the data representation language message from the service according to the data representation language schema.

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to examiner's response provided above for claims 1, 2, and 5.

**Applicant's argument: Claim 8**

Regarding claim 8, Bass fails to teach each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint.

**Examiner's response:**

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 8 recites “registering interest in one or more of the set of events comprises each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint”. Bass teaches in col. 4, lines 43 through col. 5, line 16, Note that the terms publish and subscribe should not be used in describing the flow of control in sending an event across the system. For example, assume process adapter 119 of domain 213 has an event that is to be shared with any interested process adapters 18 of domain 112. The sending channel adapter 15 will receive the event from the process adapter 19 within its domain by subscribing to the event with the broker 17. Thus, when the event is published by the originating process adapter 19, the sending channel adapter 15 will receive the event, reformat the event and send it to the channel adapter 14 of domain 112 via Internet 11. The receiving channel adapter 14 reformats the event, and then publishes the event to the broker 16, which republishes the event to subscribing process adapter 18 within domain 112. Thus, prior to transfer of events between the domains, the respective process and channel adapters of the domains must be configured to send and receive the different events.” (each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint).

**Applicant's argument: Claim 10**

Regarding claim 10, Bass does not teach receiving the data representation language schema of the service in a service advertisement of the service.

**Examiner's response:**

In conjunction with the reasons provided for claim 2 above, please refer to Bass's teachings in col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15.

**Applicant's argument: Claim 27**

"Regarding claim 27, Bass fails to anticipate a service process configured to generate a message in a data representation language."

"Bass further fails to anticipate wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of the event generated by the service process."

"Bass also does not anticipate wherein each of the one or more event message gate units is operable to distribute the data representation language representation of the event, as asserted by the Examiner."

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to Examiner's response for claim 1. Also refer to Fig. 1, elements 16 and 17.

**Applicant's argument: Claim 29**

Regarding claim 29, Bass fails to anticipate a service process configured to provide a data representation language schema defining a message interface for a set of events generated by the service and also fails to teach wherein one or more event message gate units are generated according to the data representation language schema.

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to Examiner's response for claim 1.

**Applicant's argument: Claim 31**

Regarding claim 31, Bass does not teach a service process configured to provide the data representation language schema in a service advertisement.

Art Unit: 2154

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to Examiner's response for claim 3.

**Section 103(a) Rejections:**

**Applicant's argument:**

The Office Action rejects claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as being unpatentable over Bass. Applicants assert that pending claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47 and 48 are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons given above in regard to the respective claims from which they depend.

**Examiner's response:**

Please refer to Examiner's responses provided above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-11, 14-24, 27-33 and 36- 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (hereinafter Bass) (US 6, 549, 956)

**Referring to claim 1,**

The reference teaches a method for handling events in a distributed computing environment (col.1, line 63 through col.2, line 3 and col.3, lines 6-9, "The domains may

Art Unit: 2154

be two separate corporations acting as business partners. Each domain represents a separate and distinct network of computers within the corporations Intranet. The two domains communicate via the Internet 11.”), comprising:

receiving a message in a data representation language (col.3, lines 43-50) sent to a client platform in the distributed computing environment from a service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an event generated by the service (col.2, lines 4-9, lines 15-31, Note: The reference teaches” For transport across the network, the inventive channel adapters convert the event information into a format acceptable by the network. The delivered information is then reconverted back into the event format for use in the other domain.” Thereby the reference discloses that an event (message) can be represented in any data representation language and will be converted back into the event format for use in the other domain (a client platform)); and

sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service (col.2, lines 9-15, “Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event.”)

**Referring to claim 2,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising;

receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein said data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service; and

generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema, wherein said receiving a message and said sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes are performed by the event message endpoint.( col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15, "Each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain. The two channel adapters handshake with these sets of events. Process adapters within each domain can then publish events of the exported type and expect the event to be carried to the other domain via the network protocol. Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event." Thereby the reference teaches that each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain and they handshake with sets of events even though they are in a completely different domains (receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein said data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service). Thereby the reference also teaches" Process adapters within each domain can then publish events of the exported type and expect the event to be carried to the other

Art Unit: 2154

domain via the network protocol. Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event" (generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema, wherein said receiving a message and said sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes are performed by the event message endpoint.))

**Referring to claim 3,**

The reference teaches the method ms recited in claim 2, further comprising the event message endpoint subscribing to one or more of the set of events generated by the service, wherein the service is configured to send messages including data representation language representations of an event to subscribers to the event when the event is generated. (col.3, lines 43-50).

**Referring to claim 4,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the data representation language message from the service includes an authentication credential for the service, the method further comprising the event message endpoint using the authentication credential for the service to authenticate the data representation language message as being from the service. (col.4, line57 through col.5, line15).

**Referring to claim 5,**



Art Unit: 2154

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 2, further comprising the event message endpoint verifying type correctness of the data representation language message according to the data representation language schema subsequent to said receiving a message. (col.2, lines 24-27, col.3, lines 45-50).

**Referring to claim 6,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the data representation language schema defines a set of messages that the service may send to the event message endpoint, the method further comprising the event message endpoint verifying the correctness of the data representation language message from the service according to the data representation language schema. (col.2, lines 24-27, col.3, lines 45-50).

**Referring to claim 7,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 2, further comprising each of the one or more processes registering interest in one or more of the set of events generated by the service with the event message endpoint subsequent to said generating an event message endpoint. (Fig.1, col. 4, line 43 through col.5, line15).

**Referring to claim 8,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 7, wherein said registering interest in one or more of the set of events comprises each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint; wherein said sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service(col.4, line 57-

Art Unit: 2154

60, Note: Thereby the reference teaches that the processes as well as the adapters are configured to do the claimed element.) comprises:

the event message endpoint calling an event handler method of each process registered with the event message endpoint to the event; and the event message endpoint passing the data representation language representation of the event to each called event handler (col.3, lines 22-50, Note: The channel adapters are capable of executing the task as claimed.)

**Referring to claim 9,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 7, further comprising:

a process unregistering interest in a first event of the service; and the event message gate unsubscribing to the first event with the service subsequent to said unregistering; wherein the service is further configured to not send messages including data representation language representations of the first event to event message endpoints that are unsubscribed to the first event. (col.4, line 57 through col.5, line 15).

**Referring to claims 10 and 11,**

The reference teaches the method as recited in claim 2, further comprising receiving the data representation language schema of the service in a service advertisement of the service. (col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15, "Each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain. The two channel adapters handshake with these sets of events. Process adapters within each domain can then publish events of the exported type and expect the event to be carried to the other domain via the network protocol. Likewise, a

Art Unit: 2154

process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event.”, and wherein the one or more processes are executing within the client platform (Fig.1, element 18 and 19).

**Referring to claim 14,**

Claim 14 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 14 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

**Referring to claim 15,**

Claim 15 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 2. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

**Referring to claim 16,**

Claim 16 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 5. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

**Referring to claim 17,**

Claim 17 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 6. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

**Referring to claim 18,**

Claim 18 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 10. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 10.

**Referring to claim 19,**

Claim 19 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 3. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

**Referring to claim 20,**

Claim 20 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 4. Therefore, claim 20 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

**Referring to claim 21,**

Claim 21 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 7. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7.

**Referring to claim 22,**

Claim 22 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 8. Therefore, claim 22 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 8.

**Referring to claim 23,**

Claim 23 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 9. Therefore, claim 23 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 9.

**Referring to claim 24,**

Claim 24 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 11. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 11.

**Referring to claim 27,**

The reference teaches a device, comprising;  
a processor; a memory coupled to said processor (Fig.1-3);  
a service process Configured to:  
generate an event;

generate a message in a data representation language, wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of the event generated by the service process(col.2, lines 4-9, lines 15-31, Note: The reference teaches "For transport across the network, the inventive channel adapters convert the event information into a format acceptable by the network. The delivered information is then reconverted back into the event format for use in the other domain." Thereby the reference discloses that an event (message) can be represented in any data representation language and will be converted back into the event format for use in the other domain (a client platform)); and

send the message to one or more event message gate units (col.2, lines 9-15, "Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event.") in the distributed computing environment(col.1, line 63 through col.2, line 3 and col.3, lines 6-9, "The domains may be two separate corporations acting as business partners. Each domain represents a separate and distinct network of computers within the corporations Intranet. The two domains communicate via the Internet 11.");

wherein each of the one or more event message gate units are operable to distribute the data representation language representation of the event sent in the message from the service process to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service process (Fig.1, col.3, lines 5-50).

Art Unit: 2154

**Referring to claim 28,**

The reference teaches the device as recited in claim 27, wherein the device further comprises a service message gate unit, wherein said generating a message and said sending the message are performed by the service message gate unit on behalf of the service process (col.col.3, lines 22-25).

**Referring to claim 29,**

Claim 29 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 2. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

**Referring to claim 30,**

Claim 30 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 6. Therefore, claim 30 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

**Referring to claim 31,**

Claim 31 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 10. Therefore, claim 31 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 10.

**Referring to claim 32,**

Claim 32 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 3. Therefore, claim 32 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

**Referring to claim 33,**

Claim 33 is a claim to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claim 4. Therefore, claim 33 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

**Referring to claim 36,**

Art Unit: 2154

Claim 36 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 1. Therefore, Claim 36 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

**Referring to claim 37,**

Claim 37 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 2. Therefore, Claim 37 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

**Referring to claim 38,**

Claim 38 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 3. Therefore, Claim 38 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

**Referring to claim 39,**

Claim 39 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 4. Therefore, Claim 39 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

**Referring to claim 40,**

Claim 40 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement

Art Unit: 2154

the steps of method of claim 5. Therefore, Claim 40 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

**Referring to claim 41,**

Claim 41 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 6. Therefore, Claim 41 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

**Referring to claim 42,**

Claim 42 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 7. Therefore, Claim 42 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 7.

**Referring to claim 43,**

Claim 43 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 8. Therefore, Claim 43 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 8.

**Referring to claim 44,**

Claim 44 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 9. Therefore, Claim 44 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 9.



**Referring to claim 45,**

Claim 45 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 10. Therefore, Claim 45 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 10.

**Referring to claim 46,**

Claim 46 is a claim to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claim 11. Therefore, Claim 46 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 11.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bass et al. (hereinafter Bass) (US 6, 549, 956) in view of Meltzer et al. (hereinafter Meltzer) (US 6, 542, 912)

**Referring to claims 12 and 13,**

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Bass as stated above, the reference explicitly fails to teach wherein the event is a Java event and the data representation

Art Unit: 2154

language is extensible Markup Language (XML). The reference Meltzer teaches "By translating the elements of the XML document into JAVA events or other programming structures that are suitable for use by the transaction processing front end of the respective nodes enables rich functionality at nodes utilizing the documents being traded." (col.14, lines 25-32). Thereby not only the reference teaches the claimed elements but provides the motivation to do so along with. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Meltzer into the teachings of Bass such that the transaction process front end (channel adapters are configured to) is able to operate in a publish and subscribe architecture that enables the addition of new listener programs without the knowledge of or impact on other listening programs in the system as taught by the reference.

**Referring to claims 25, 26, 34 and 35,**

Claims 25, 26, 34 and 35 are claims to the device configured for carrying out the steps of method of claims 12 and 13. Therefore, claims 25, 26, 34 and 35 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 12 and 13.

**Referring to claims 47 and 48,**

Claims 47 and 48 are claims to a computer readable carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement the steps of method of claims 12 and 13. Therefore, Claims 47 and 48 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 12 and 13.

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp  
\*\*\*

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100